Can the “Darmstadt oscillations” be treated as two closely spaced mass–eigenstates of the H–like mother ions ?

M. Faber[a], A. N. Ivanov[a,b], P. Kienle[b,c], E. L. Kryshen[d], M. Pitschmann[a], N. I. Troitskaya[e]
[a]*Atominstitut der Österreichischen Universitäten, Technische Universität Wien, Wiedner Hauptstrasse 8-10, A-1040 Wien, Österreich*
[b]*Stefan Meyer Institut für subatomare Physik Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Boltzmanngasse 3, A-1090, Wien, Österreich*
[c]*Excellence Cluster Universe Technische Universität München, D-85748 Garching, Germany*
[c]*Petersburg Nuclear Physics Institute, 188300 Gatchina, Orlova roscha 1, Russian Federation*
[d] *Petersburg Nuclear Physics Institute, 188300 Gatchina, Orlova roscha 1, Russian Federation, and*
[e]*State Polytechnic University of St. Petersburg, Polytechnicheskaya 29, 195251, Russian*[*]

(Dated: November 6, 2008)

We discuss the proposal that the “Darmstadt oscillations” of the orbital K–shell electron capture decay (EC) rate of the H–like heavy ions are caused by quantum beats of two coherently excited, closely spaced mass–eigenstates of decaying H–like heavy ions. We show that such a mechanism to explain the time modulation of the EC–decay rates of the H–like heavy ions leads to the time modulation of the β^+–decay rate of these ions with the same period. Such a time–dependence of the β^+–decay rate of the H–like heavy ions contradicts the experimental data of GSI.

PACS: 23.40.Bw, 33.15.Pw, 13.15.+g, 14.60.Pq

arXiv:0811.0922v1 [nucl-th] 6 Nov 2008

Recently Litvinov *et al.* [1] have observed that the K–shell electron capture (EC) decay rates of H–like ${}^{140}\mathrm{Pr}^{58+}$ and ${}^{142}\mathrm{Pm}^{60+}$ ions

$$\begin{aligned} {}^{140}\mathrm{Pr}^{58+} &\to {}^{140}\mathrm{Ce}^{58+} + \nu_e, \\ {}^{142}\mathrm{Pm}^{60+} &\to {}^{142}\mathrm{Nd}^{60+} + \nu_e \end{aligned} \qquad (1)$$

have an unexpected periodic time modulation of exponential decay curves. The rates of the number N^{EC}_d of daughter ions ${}^{140}\mathrm{Ce}^{58+}$ and ${}^{142}\mathrm{Nd}^{60+}$

$$\frac{dN^{EC}_d(t)}{dt} = \lambda_{EC}(t)\, N_m(t), \qquad (2)$$

where $N_m(t)$ is the number of the H–like mother ions ${}^{140}\mathrm{Pr}^{58+}$ or ${}^{142}\mathrm{Pm}^{60+}$[1] and $\lambda^{(\mathrm{H})}_{EC}(t)$ is the EC–decay rate, are periodic functions, caused by a periodic time–dependence of the EC–decay rates

$$\lambda_{EC}(t) = \lambda_{EC}\,(1 + a_{EC}\,\cos(\omega_{EC} t + \phi_{EC})) \qquad (3)$$

with a period $T_{EC} = 2\pi/\omega_{EC} \simeq 7\,\mathrm{sec}$, an amplitude $a_{EC} \simeq 0.20$ and a phase ϕ_{EC}.

In the articles [2, 3] and the reports [5, 6] we have proposed an explanation of the periodic time–dependence of the EC–decay rates as an interference of two neutrino mass–eigenstates ν_1 and ν_2 with masses m_1 and m_2, respectively. The period T_{EC} of the time–dependence has been related to the difference $\Delta m^2_{21} = m^2_2 - m^2_1$ of the squared neutrino masses m_2 and m_1 as follows

$$\omega_{EC} = \frac{2\pi}{T_{EC}} = \frac{\Delta m^2_{21}}{2\gamma M_m}, \qquad (4)$$

where M_m is the mass of the mother ion and $\gamma = 1.43$ is a Lorentz factor [1]. The analysis of the “Darmstadt oscillations” by means of the mass–differences of neutrino mass–eigenstates has been carried out also in [7, 8] and [9]. In a subsequent analysis we also showed that the β^+–branches of the decaying H–like heavy ions do not show time modulation, because of the broad energy spectrum of the neutrinos in the corresponding three–body decays and proposed a test of such a behaviour [4].

According to atomic quantum beat experiments [10, 11], the explanation of the “Darmstadt oscillations”, proposed in [2]–[6, 8], bears similarity with quantum beats of atomic transitions, when an excited atomic eigenstate decays into a coherent state of two (or several) lower lying atomic eigenstates. In the case of the EC–decay one deals with a transition from the initial state $|m\rangle$ to the final state $|d\,\nu_e\rangle$, where the electron neutrino is a coherent superposition of two neutrino mass–eigenstates with the energy difference equal to $\omega_{21} = \Delta m^2_{21}/2M_m$ related to ω_{EC} as $\omega_{EC} = \omega_{21}/\gamma$.

Another mechanism of the “Darmstadt oscillations” has been proposed by Giunti in [12] and Kienert *et al.* [13]. The authors [12, 13] assume the existence of two closely spaced mass-eigenstates of the H–like heavy ion in the initial state of the EC–decay and describe the initial state of the mother ion by the coherent superposition of the wave functions of two mass-eigenstates

$$|m\rangle = \cos\theta\,|m'\rangle + \sin\theta\,|m''\rangle, \qquad (5)$$

where $|m'\rangle$ and $|m''\rangle$ are two mass–eigenstates of the mother ion with masses $M_{m'}$ and $M_{m''}$, respectively, θ is a mixing angle. By definition of eigenstates the mass–eigenstates of the H–like heavy ion $|m'\rangle$ and $|m''\rangle$ should be orthogonal $\langle m'|m''\rangle = 0$.

Unlike our analysis [2, 3, 8], the authors [12, 13] draw an analogy of the "Darmstadt oscillations" with quantum beats of atomic transitions [11], when an atom is excited to a coherent superposition of two closely spaced upper energy eigenstates and decays into the same lower lying energy eigenstate. According to [11], the intensity of radiation, caused by a transition from such a coherent state into the same lower energy eigenstate, has a periodic time–dependent term with a period inverse proportional to the energy–difference $\Delta E_{m'm''}$ between two upper energy eigenstates.

The EC–decay rate of the mother ion from the $|m\rangle$ state is equal to [3]

$$\lambda^{(m)}_{EC}(t) = \lambda_{EC}(1 + 2\sin 2\theta\cos(\Delta E_{m'm''}t)), \quad (6)$$

where λ_{EC} is the EC–decay constant [2, 3, 14] and $\Delta E_{m'm''}$ is the energy difference of the mass–eigenstates $|m'\rangle$ and $|m''\rangle$. This shows a periodic dependence of the EC–decay rate with a period inverse proportional to $\Delta E_{m'm''}$.

However, the H–like heavy ions, subjected to the EC–decays, are unstable also under β^+–decays [1]: $m \to d + e^+ + \nu_e$. Following the standard procedure for the calculation of the β^+–decay rates [3, 4, 14] one gets

$$\lambda^{(m)}_{\beta^+}(t) = \lambda_{\beta^+}(1 + 2\sin 2\theta\,\cos(\Delta E_{m'm''}t)), \quad (7)$$

where the β^+–decay constant λ_{β^+} has been calculated in [14]. Hence, according to [12, 13], the β^+–decay rates of the H–like heavy ions should have the same periodic time–dependence as the EC–decay rates. However, this contradicts preliminary experimental data on the time–dependence of the β^+–decay rates of the H–like heavy $^{142}\mathrm{Pm}^{60+}$ ions at GSI, which indicate no time modulation [15]. This shows that the "Darmstadt oscillations" cannot be treated as quantum beats of two closely spaced mass–eigenstates of the H–like mother ions.

There is also another reason making a time–dependence of the EC–decay rates of the H–like heavy ions impossible in the approaches proposed in [12, 13]. For example, the mass–eigenstates $|m'\rangle$ and $|m''\rangle$ of the mother ions, injected into the storage sing, would be statistically populated by the fast projectile fragmentation. Such a process can also populate the system of the H–like mother ions with the coherent state $|\tilde{m}\rangle = -\sin\theta\,|m'\rangle + \cos\theta\,|m''\rangle$. Due to statistical equivalence and principle indistinguishability of these coherent states the probabilities P_m and $P_{\tilde{m}}$ of the production of the coherent states $|m\rangle$ and $|\tilde{m}\rangle$, related by $P_m + P_{\tilde{m}} = 1$, should be equal $P_m = P_{\tilde{m}} = \frac{1}{2}$.

The decay rate $\lambda^{(\tilde{m})}_{EC}(t)$ and $\lambda^{(\tilde{m})}_{\beta^+}(t)$ of the EC and β^+ decays of the H–like heavy ions from the coherent state $|\tilde{m}\rangle$ are equal to

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda^{(\tilde{m})}_{EC}(t) &= \lambda_{EC}(1 - 2\sin 2\theta\cos(\Delta E_{m'm''}t)),\\ \lambda^{(\tilde{m})}_{\beta^+}(t) &= \lambda_{\beta^+}(1 - 2\sin 2\theta\cos(\Delta E_{m'm''}t)). \quad (8)\end{aligned}$$

The total EC and β^+ decay rates of the H–like heavy ions from the coherent states $|m\rangle$ and $|\tilde{m}\rangle$ are defined by

$$\begin{aligned}&\lambda_{EC}(t) = P_m\lambda^{(m)}_{EC}(t) + P_{\tilde{m}}\,\lambda^{(\tilde{m})}_{EC}(t) = \lambda_{EC}\\ &\times(1 + 2\sin 2\theta\,(P_m - P_{\tilde{m}})\cos(\Delta E_{m'm''}t)),\\ &\lambda_{\beta^+}(t) = P_m\lambda^{(m)}_{\beta^+}(t) + P_{\tilde{m}}\,\lambda^{(\tilde{m})}_{\beta^+}(t) = \lambda_{\beta^+}\\ &\times(1 + 2\sin 2\theta\,(P_m - P_{\tilde{m}})\cos(\Delta E_{m'm''}t)). \quad (9)\end{aligned}$$

For $P_m = P_{\tilde{m}} = \frac{1}{2}$ one expects no interference terms in the EC and β^+ decay rates of the H–like heavy ions.

We would like to accentuate that the analysis of the "Darmstadt oscillations" in terms of the interference of neutrino mass–eigenstates [2, 3] allows to explain a time–independence of the β^+–decay rate of the H–like heavy ions [4].

We acknowledge fruitful discussions with T. Ericson, F. Bosch and Yu. Litvinov.

---

* Electronic address: ivanov@kph.tuwien.ac.at

[1] Yu. A. Litvinov *et al.* (the GSI Collaboration), Phys. Lett. B **664**, 162 (2008).

[2] A. N. Ivanov *at al.*, arXiv: 0801.2121 [nucl–th], arXiv: 0803.1289 [nucl–th]

[3] A. N. Ivanov *et al.*, arXiv: 0804.1311 [nucl–th], arXiv: 0807.2750 [nucl–th]

[4] A. N. Ivanov *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Letters **101**, 182501 (2008).

[5] P. Kienle, Talk at Annual Meeting of ENTApP N6/WP1 "Physics of Massive Neutrinos", 19 May – 22 May of 2008 on Milos Island, Greece.

[6] A. N. Ivanov *et al.*, Talk at Annual Meeting of ENTApP N6/WP1 "Physics of Massive Neutrinos", 19 May – 22 May of 2008 on Milos Island, Greece.

[7] H. Lipkin, arXiv: 0805.0435 [hep-ph].

[8] M. Faber, arXiv: 801.3262 [nucl-th].

[9] H. Kleinert, P. Kienle, arXiv: 0803.2938 [nucl–th].

[10] H. J. Andreä, Physics Scripta **9**, 257 (1974); Phys. Rev. A **2**, 2200 (1970).

[11] W. W. Chow *at al.*, Phys. Rev. A **11**, 1380 (1975).

[12] C. Giunti, Phys. Lett. B **665**, 92 (2005).

[13] H. Kienert *et al.*, arXiv: 0808.2389 [hep–ph].

[14] A. N. Ivanov *et al.*, Phys. Rev. C **78**, 025503 (2008).

[15] F. Bosch (the GSI Collaboration), (private communication), 2008; A talk at EXA08 Conference, 15 - 18 September, SMI of Austrian Academie of Sciences, Vienna, 2008.